





APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/435,940	11/09/1999	LEWIS V. ROTHROCK	042390.P5387	5902
7:	590 01/17/2002			
MATTHEW C FAGAN			EXAMINER	
	KOLOFF TAYLOR & RE BOULEVARD	ZAFFMAN	HARRISON, CHANTE E	
SEVENTH FLO			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

LOS ANGELES, CA 900251026

2672

DATE MAILED: 01/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			(5)
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/435,940	ROTHROCK, LEWIS \	<i>1.</i>
•	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chante Harrison	2672	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addres	is
THE REPLY FILED 02 January 2002 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearamentation (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appli ) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply ich places the applicat	to a ion in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adviewent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See	MPEP
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mo earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in nths after the mailing date of the final rejo	e fee. The appropriate extens the final Office action; or (2) ection, even if timely filed, ma	ion fee under as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal	period set forth in of the appeal.	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) \( \subseteq  they raise new issues that would require further than the control of the		(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•		
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or sim	plifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed a	mendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	r reconsideration has been cons e Continuation Sheet.	sidered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			d an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-31</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. $\square$ The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	proved by the Examine	er.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·•	
10. Other:	·		
5. Patent and Trademark Office			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Mann divides the image into plural areas, which are identified as common and non-common image portions that are relative to another image. Additionally, he identifies the common image portions as portions of overlap as indicated in the final rejection.

MATTHEW LUU PRIMARY EXAMINER

molec